



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,045	09/22/2003	Ying Chau	0492611-0505 (MIT 9991 US	7299
24280	7590	11/06/2006	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			ROGERS, JAMES WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1618

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,045	CHAU ET AL.	
	Examiner James W. Rogers, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1618	

All Participants:

(1) James W. Rogers, Ph.D.

(2) Charles E. Lyon, Ph.D.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2006

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 10:05 and 10:55

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 12 and 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Rogers called Dr. Lyon at 10:05 to discuss the support for currently amended claims 1, 12 and 13, specifically the new digestive enzymes serine proteases and matrix metalloproteinases. Examiner Rogers left a message to Dr. Lyon that the support for the enzymes said to be in appendix A could not be found. Dr. Lyons called examiner Rogers back at 0:55 and stated that the appendix was submitted on 9/22/2003 and would provide evidence via fax that the appendix was sent even though there is no record on the examiners docket in eDAN.